UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/757,726	01/10/2001	Toru Sorihashi	55522 (904)	8376

21874	7590	03/08/2005

EDWARDS & ANGELL, LLP
P.O. BOX 55874
BOSTON, MA 02205

EXAMINER
BURGE, LONDRA C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

DATE MAILED: 03/08/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

		Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary		09/757,726	SORIHASHI, TORU
		Examiner	Art Unit	
		Londra C Burge	2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _21 December 2004_.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
   closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-23_ is/are pending in the application.

   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-23_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

   a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

   1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

   2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

   3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
      application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to communications: Amendment filed 12/21/2004.

2.   Claims 1-23 are pending. Claims 1, 20 and 23 are independent claims.

3.   This action has been made Final.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   **The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:**

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5.   **Claims 1-23 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ichiriki U.S. Patent No. 6,040,920 filed 2/19/1997 in view of Suzuki et al. (herein after Suzuki) U.S. Patent No. 6,213,652 B1 filed 10/17/1995.**

       In regard to independent claim 1, Ichiriki discloses *a data creating section for creating data file* (Ichiriki Col 12 Lines 15-20); *a data reference section for displaying reference data and when creating the data file* (Ichiriki Col 12 Lines 65-67 and Col 13 Lines 1-5)

       Ichiriki does not specifically disclose *log recording/reproducing section, which creates log data including history data of operations executed by said data creating section and said data reference section.* However, Suzuki mentions this process (Suzuki Col 42 Lines 32-44). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Suzuki to Ichiriki, providing Ichiriki the benefit of creating a log with a history of operation so the user can keep track of operations that have been used.

Ichiriki does not specifically disclose *controls said data creating section and said data reference section to re-execute the operations stored in the log data so as to reproduce a creation of the data file when displaying the data file.* However, Suzuki mentions a similar process (Suzuki Col 48 Lines 3-67 and Col 49 Lines 1-47). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Suzuki to Ichiriki, providing Ichiriki the benefit of executing or scheduling a file or job that has already been logging which will make the process quicker.

In regard to dependent claim 2, Ichiriki does not specifically disclose *said log recording/reproducing section records all the operations executed by the data creating section and the data reference section in the log data when creating the data file.* However, Suzuki mentions this process (Suzuki Col 42 Lines 32-44). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Suzuki to Ichiriki, providing Ichiriki the benefit of creating a log with a history of operation so the user can keep track of operations that have been used.

Ichiriki does not specifically disclose *controlling the data creating section and the data reference section to re-execute all the operations stored in the log data, so as to reproduce all the creation processes of the data file when displaying the data file.* However, Suzuki mentions a similar process (Suzuki Col 48 Lines 3-67 and Col 49 Lines 1-47). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Suzuki to Ichiriki, providing Ichiriki the benefit of executing or scheduling a file or job that has already been logging which will make the process quicker.

In regard to dependent claim 3, Ichiriki discloses *partial data as selected by the reader* (Ichiriki Col 14 Lines 26-31)

Ichiriki does not specifically disclose *said log recording/reproducing section reproduces creation processes of ... when displaying the data file.* However, Suzuki mentions this process (Suzuki Col 42 Lines 32-44). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Suzuki to Ichiriki, providing Ichiriki the benefit of creating a log with a history of operation so the user can keep track of operations that have been used.

In regard to dependent claim 4, Ichiriki does not specifically disclose *when creating the data file, said log recording/reproducing section records a position on the data file a related portion of each operation executed by the data creating section and the data reference section as the position indicative information of each operation* However, Suzuki mentions this process (Suzuki Col 42 Lines 32-44 and Col 7 Lines 42-65). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Suzuki to Ichiriki, providing Ichiriki the benefit of creating a log with a history of related operations so the user can keep track of operations that have been used.

Ichiriki does not specifically disclose *when displaying the data file, said log the position recording/reproducing section specifies of the partial data as selected by the reader, and based on the position indicative information, selects the operation related to the partial data from the log data, to be re-executed by said data creating section and said data reference section.* However, Suzuki mentions this process (Suzuki Col 42 Lines 32-44 and Suzuki Col 48 Lines 3-67 and Col 49 Lines 1-47). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time of the invention to apply Suzuki to Ichiriki, providing Ichiriki the benefit of creating a log

with a history of operation so the user can keep track of operations that have been used.

In regard to dependent claim 5, Ichiriki does not specifically disclose *said log*

recording/reproducing section changes the position indicative information of each operation as

already stored in the log data according to a change made in the data file. However, Suzuki

mentions this process (Suzuki Col 42 Lines 32-44 and Col 7 Lines 42-65 and Col 11 Lines 63-67

Col 12 Lines 1-10). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

the invention to apply Suzuki to Ichiriki, providing Ichiriki the benefit of creating a log with a

history of changes or modified operations so the user can keep track of operations that have been

used.

In regard to dependent claim 6, Ichiriki does not specifically disclose *when a deletion*

is made with respect to the data file, said log recording/reproducing section marks an operation

related to the deleted portion on the log data with a predetermined mark. However, Suzuki

mentions this process (Suzuki Col 42 Lines 32-44 and Col 7 Lines 42-65 and Col 54 Lines 10-13

and Col 57 Lines 15-18). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time of the invention to apply Suzuki to Ichiriki, providing Ichiriki the benefit of creating a log

with a history of deleted operations so the user can keep track of operations that have been used

or deleted.

In regard to dependent claim 7, Ichiriki does not specifically disclose *when a deleted*

portion is re-inputted; said log recording/reproducing section deletes the mark from the log

data. However, Suzuki mentions this process (Suzuki Col 54 Lines 10-13 and Col 57 Lines 15-

18). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to

apply Suzuki to Ichiriki, providing Ichiriki the benefit of inputting a deleted portion and deleting

a mark from the log data so the user can keep better track of the data.

In regard to dependent claim 8, Ichiriki does not specifically disclose *said data*

creating section and said data reference section respectively provided with operation history

data creating sections for creating history data of operations they executed and transmitting the

history data as created to said log recording/reproducing section. However, Suzuki mentions

this process (Suzuki Col 42 Lines 32-44). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in

the art at the time of the invention to apply Suzuki to Ichiriki, providing Ichiriki the benefit of

creating a log with a history of operation so the user can keep track of operations that have been

used.

In regard to dependent claim 9, Ichiriki does not specifically disclose *an operation*

supervision section creating history data of operations executed by said data creating section

and said data reference section and transmitting the history data as created to said log

recording/reproducing section. However, Suzuki mentions this process (Suzuki Col 42 Lines 32-

44). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to

apply Suzuki to Ichiriki, providing Ichiriki the benefit of creating a log with a history of

operation so the user can keep track of operations that have been used.

In regard to dependent claim 10, Ichiriki discloses *a display control section for*

supervising a display state of a display screen, which is open when creating the data file (Ichiriki

Col 12 Lines 15-20) (Ichiriki Col 12 Lines 65-67 and Col 13 Lines 1-5)

Ichiriki does not specifically disclose *wherein said log recording/reproducing section*

controls said display control section so as to store in the log data a display state of the screen

opened when executing each operation. However, Suzuki mentions a similar process (Suzuki Col 48 Lines 3-67 and Col 49 Lines 1-47). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Suzuki to Ichiriki, providing Ichiriki the benefit of executing or scheduling a file or job that has already been logging which will make the process quicker.

In regard to dependent claim 11, Ichiriki discloses *determines whether each screen is used in the creation of the data file based on the display state of the display screen* (Ichiriki Col 2 Lines 45-55).

Ichiriki does not specifically disclose *said log recording/reproducing section and stores the result of determination in the log data.* However, Suzuki mentions this process (Suzuki Col 42 Lines 32-44). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Suzuki to Ichiriki, providing Ichiriki the benefit of creating a log of operations so the user can keep track of operations that have been used.

In regard to dependent claim 12, Ichiriki discloses *said ...section determines whether the display screen is used for the data.* (Ichiriki Col 2 Lines 45-55)

Ichiriki does not specifically disclose *said log recording/reproducing section determines determination condition set beforehand by the user.* However, Suzuki mentions this process (Suzuki Col 42 Lines 32-44 Col 63 Lines 6-20 and Col 49 Lines 60-67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Suzuki to Ichiriki, providing Ichiriki the benefit of creating a log of operations so the user can keep track of operations that have been used.

In regard to dependent claim 13, Ichiriki does not specifically disclose *said log recording/reproducing section stores only operations executed by predetermined specific data creating section and data reference section in the log data.* However, Suzuki mentions this process (Suzuki Col 42 Lines 32-44 Col 63 Lines 6-20 and Col 34 Lines 30-40). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Suzuki to Ichiriki, providing Ichiriki the benefit of creating a log of operations so the user can keep track of operations that have been used.

In regard to dependent claim 14, Ichiriki does not specifically disclose *said log recording/reproducing section prevents operations executed by predetermined specific data creating section and said data reference section from being stored in the log data.* However, Suzuki mentions this process (Suzuki Col 42 Lines 32-44 Col 63 Lines 6-20 and Col 34 Lines 30-40). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Suzuki to Ichiriki, providing Ichiriki the benefit of creating a log of operations so the user can keep track of operations that have been used.

In regard to dependent claim 15, Ichiriki does not specifically disclose *said log recording/reproducing section edits the log data according to an instruction given by the user.* However, Suzuki mentions this process (Suzuki Col 42 Lines 32-44 Col 63 Lines 6-20 and Col 54 Lines 41-45). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Suzuki to Ichiriki, providing Ichiriki the benefit of creating a log of operations so the user can keep track of operations that have been used.

In regard to dependent claim 16, Ichiriki does not specifically disclose *a data recording section for storing the data file created by said data creating section in relation to the*

log data created by said log recording/reproducing section. However, Suzuki mentions this process (Suzuki Col 42 Lines 32-44 Col 63 Lines 6-20 and Col 4 Lines 13-20). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Suzuki to Ichiriki, providing Ichiriki the benefit of creating a log of operations so the user can keep track of operations that have been used.

In regard to dependent claim 17, Ichiriki discloses *said data creating section includes ...for storing a program for creating the data file and a reading section for creating the data file by reading the program.* (Ichiriki Col 12 Lines 15-20) (Ichiriki Col 12 Lines 65-67 and Col 13 Lines 1-5)

Ichiriki does not specifically disclose *a memory section.* However, Suzuki mentions a memory (Suzuki Col 15 Lines 65-67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Suzuki to Ichiriki, providing Ichiriki the benefit of storing information in a memory so the user can save data.

In regard to dependent claim 18, Ichiriki discloses *said data reference section ... section for storing a program for making a reference to the data file, and a reading section for making a reference to the data file by reading the program.* (Ichiriki Col 12 Lines 15-20) (Ichiriki Col 12 Lines 65-67 and Col 13 Lines 1-5)

Ichiriki does not specifically disclose *a memory section.* However, Suzuki mentions a memory (Suzuki Col 15 Lines 65-67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Suzuki to Ichiriki, providing Ichiriki the benefit of storing information in a memory so the user can save data.

In regard to dependent claim 19, Ichiriki discloses said *data creating section creates document data.* (Ichiriki Col 12 Lines 15-20)

In regard to dependent claim 20, Ichiriki does not specifically disclose *(a) a log data creation step for creating log data including history data of operations executed by said data creating section and said data reference section when creating the data file* However, Suzuki mentions this process (Suzuki Col 42 Lines 32-44). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Suzuki to Ichiriki, providing Ichiriki the benefit of creating a log with a history of operation so the user can keep track of operations that have been used.

Ichiriki does not specifically disclose *(b) a reproducing step for controlling said data creating section and said data reference section to re-execute the operations stored in the log data to reproduce a creation of the data file.* However, Suzuki mentions a similar process (Suzuki Col 48 Lines 3-67 and Col 49 Lines 1-47). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Suzuki to Ichiriki, providing Ichiriki the benefit of executing or scheduling a file or job that has already been logging which will make the process quicker.

In regard to dependent claim 21, Ichiriki does not specifically disclose *said reproducing step, all the operations stored in the log data are re-executed by said data creating section and said data reference section to reproduce all the creation processes of the data file.* However, Suzuki mentions a similar process (Suzuki Col 48 Lines 3-67 and Col 49 Lines 1-47). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply

Suzuki to Ichiriki, providing Ichiriki the benefit of executing or scheduling a file or job that has already been logging which will make the process quicker.

In regard to dependent claim 22, Ichiriki discloses *in said reproducing step, creation processes of partial data selected by the reader are reproduced.* (Ichiriki Col 14 Lines 26-31)

In regard to dependent claim 23, Ichiriki does not specifically disclose *a reproduction of a creation of a data file is realized by creating log data including history data of operations executed by said data creating section and said data reference section when creating the data file* However, Suzuki mentions this process (Suzuki Col 42 Lines 32-44). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Suzuki to Ichiriki, providing Ichiriki the benefit of creating a log with a history of operation so the user can keep track of operations that have been used.

Ichiriki does not specifically disclose *re-executing the operations as stored in the log data by said data creating section and said data reference section.* However, Suzuki mentions a similar process (Suzuki Col 48 Lines 3-67 and Col 49 Lines 1-47). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Suzuki to Ichiriki, providing Ichiriki the benefit of executing or scheduling a file or job that has already been logging which will make the process quicker.

Response to Arguments

6.   **Applicant's arguments filed 12/21/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.**

The applicant argues that Suzuki fails to suggest a log/reproducing section (Page 4 Paragraph 2 and 4). However, Suzuki mentions this a process of logging data (Suzuki Col 42 Lines 32-44). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Suzuki to Ichiriki, providing Ichiriki the benefit of creating a log with a history of operation so the user can keep track of operations that have been used.

The applicant argues that Suzuki fails to suggest re executing operations in the stored log data (Page 4 Paragraph 2). However, Suzuki mentions repeating a process a number of times (Suzuki Col 42 Lines 18-30).

Conclusion

7.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Londra C Burge whose telephone number is (571) 272-4122. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30am to 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

LCB
3/1/2005

CESAR PAULA
PRIMARY EXAMINER